

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,475	06/23/2006	Manabu Sutoh	71,051-036	1993
27305 7530 (960862009) HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC 450 West Fourth Street Royal Oak, MI 48067			EXAMINER	
			CHANG, VICTOR 8	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 1794

## NOTE:

Applicants argue at Remarks page 6:

"MPEP 2129 is very clear that "[a] statement by an applicant > in the specification or made during prosecution identifying the <u>work of another</u> as "prior art" is an admission \*\*-which can be relied upon for both anticipation and obviousness determinations." (Emphasis original). Clearly, when the Applicants' statements **do not** identify work of another, other conditions apply. In particular, as also set forth in MPEP 2129, even if labeled as "prior art," the <u>work of the same inventive entity</u> may not be considered prior art against the claims unless it falls under one of the statutory categories."

However, applicants have failed to provide any evidentiary support that the APA is not the work by another. The examiner asserts that it is *prima facie* proper to use APA as basis of rejection, as indicated by MPEP. Applicants may wish to submit an affidavit along with evidentiary support for the purpose to overcome the rejection based on APA.